

The green on the top is the light. It is the same in all of these. The blue is the energy. And notice that the incandescent bulb is a better heater than light source. I brood my chickens with that.

Notice the light-emitting diode. If you have an LED flashlight, you will forget when you put batteries in it, and we need to move to these kinds of technologies.

I have one final chart to end this discussion with. There are two major entities in the world that follow the production and consumption of oil, and they make assumptions about the future. I wouldn't pay much attention to their assumptions about the future because they have been consistently wrong, but they are very good at charting what we have used.

This is the EIA, the Energy Information Administration, a part of our Department of Energy; and it is the IEA, the International Energy Association, this is a part of the United Nations. This is a group that has been following what has been going on in Iran. Both of them have been tracking what we have been using in oil, and these are their lives.

□ 1730

And these are their lines. And notice, for about the last 3 years, 30 months or more, they're essentially flat. And during that time, that's just about the time that I have been coming here to the floor. It'll be 3 years the 14th day of March that I made my first speech on the floor here relative to this subject. And during that time, oil has doubled in price. Here we are at about \$50 a barrel. And there we are up there at, well, off the chart now, above \$100 a barrel.

In the few moments remaining to us, I'd like to look at a couple of charts. This is a very recent statement, January 22, by the CEO of Shell Oil. By the year 2100, the world's energy system will be radically different from today. Boy, will it. The world's current predicament limits our maneuvering room. We are experiencing a step change in the growth of energy demand. And Shell estimates that after 2015, supplies of easy to access oil and gas will no longer keep up with demand. He's saying it's going to peak about then.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying again that this is an enormously invigorating challenge. America's up to this challenge. What we need is the leadership necessary to make this happen.

OIL AND GAS AND THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, we all spend time with search engines. We all spend time with Google. You know, if you Google the term "gambling" you'll get millions of matches. And of course, you can't come to a Google page with-

out seeing the Wikipedia. And if you go to Wikipedia to see about gambling, it states that "Gambling has a specific economic definition, referring to wagering money or something of material value on an event with an uncertain outcome."

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what is going on with energy policy here in the United States House of Representatives. Earlier today, the price of oil rose to a record high, nearly \$106 a barrel.

We all feel pain at the pump. In fact, I drive a hybrid car back home, but it's still getting awfully expensive to fill up. And like any good Texan, I have a Ford F-150 pickup truck, and last week when I had to fill it with metal to drive to the recycler, it cost me almost \$80 to fill up the truck.

In fact, since the Speaker of the House took the gavel on January 1, 2007, the average price of gasoline has increased by about \$1 a gallon. The price of gas now back home for me is about where it was in the days after Hurricane Katrina. You remember Hurricane Katrina wiped out almost all the refining capacity in the United States, and the price of oil went up higher than anyone had ever seen it go before. The price of gas at the pump was higher than anyone had ever seen before, and we're there now.

And I've got to tell you, in Texas, this time of year, we generally have our cheapest gas. So what's it going to be on May 1 when we start having to have all of those fancy blended gasolines for the compliance with the Clean Air Act, and the peak of the summer driving season is about to start? We're likely to see gasoline at \$4 a gallon back home.

And how does the House of Representatives handle this uncertainty and the resulting rise at the pump? By gambling. We bet our energy policy chips on future sources of energy that cannot fully support a country as large or as energy reliant as is the United States of America.

Last week, the House of Representatives voted to provide tax breaks to consumers who make green choices, and extends tax breaks to producers of renewable energy to create green jobs. Fair enough. But unfortunately, this scheme ignores the fact that green choices and renewable energy are currently more costly for consumers and are not yet ready for full market use.

In addition, the plan offsets these breaks by sending an \$18 billion bill to the energy industry that will ultimately pass that cost on to the consumer.

Now, I'm not all that good at math, and I'm certainly not a gambler, but for the life of me, no matter how you add and subtract, I cannot understand how we stand to benefit by handicapping the very resources that we rely upon to get to work, to create our jobs, to go to school, to go to the grocery store or even to the doctor's office. By doing so, the democratic majority here

in the House of Representatives is gambling American resources on a horse they know full well cannot possibly win the race.

Thanks to this legislation, the country has now lost \$18 billion that could have been spent by experts in the energy industry to expand renewable and alternative energy capabilities, the same energy capabilities that this scheme purports to promote.

I hope these new green jobs are close to home, because workers are going to have to pay for walking shoes in addition to work boots.

Mr. Speaker, why is the majority willing to gamble our economic and national security on the uncertainty of the energy sources of tomorrow in order to bow to the billion dollar environmental industry today?

Of course, Members of this House want to expand alternative and renewable energy resources. In fact, we must do so, as we just heard in the last hour. We must have clean, safe, reliable, affordable sources of energy to continue to compete in the 21st century. But these are not new technologies in which we are investing. Ethanol has been subsidized since the 1970s, in fact, probably earlier than that. We've had solar and wind power capabilities since the 1980s. Yet, somehow this majority believes that the reason that these technologies have not taken over is because of some sort of cabal by the energy market.

So rather than financially support the research into new technology, this body chose to strap higher costs on the backs of already cash-strapped Americans. What about the needs of the Nation's families today? What about the families struggling to pay for oil to heat their homes, gas to drive their cars?

Today we face a slowing economy, a credit crunch. We have a hard hit housing sector. So how does the majority respond to those who are struggling to pay for gasoline and heating oil? They say the energy equivalent of "let them eat cake." Let them pay for something that is inherently more expensive than the current market provides.

Mr. Speaker, if California wants to cut energy demand by pricing people out of the market, as we just heard in the last hour, that's fine for them. But please don't think that the rest of the American people are going to sit back and let that happen without a fight.

Our economy is suffering. Our energy needs are great. This is not the time to double down on short-term schemes that deals long-term problems. America relies on energy to fuel our economy and our lives. That means that America needs real change to spur the development of new technology in the fields of renewable and alternative energy.

Let's spur this development in the right way and invest in all forms of energy, and let's do so without prejudice, without handicapping or picking the winners and losers based upon the